## **U.S. Department of Justice**

**Executive Office for Immigration Review** 

## Decision of the Board of Immigration Appeals

Falls Church, Virginia 22041

File:

D2000-060

Date:

OCT 2.3 2001

In re: ALEXIS I. <u>IRIZARRY</u>, ATTORNEY

IN PRACTITIONER DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS

**MOTION** 

ON BEHALF OF GENERAL COUNSEL: Jennifer J. Barnes, Esquire

ON BEHALF OF SERVICE:

Javier Balasquide, Appellate Counsel

## ORDER:

PER CURIAM. On August 31, 2001, an Immigration Judge entered a final order of discipline against the respondent, suspending him from practice before the Board, the Immigration Courts, and the Immigration and Naturalization Service. The Immigration Judge ruled that the period commenced nunc pro tunc from August 24, 2000, the date that the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico suspended the respondent from the practice of law in that jurisdiction for a period of six months. The Immigration Judge noted that the respondent had submitted documents tending to show that his suspension period in Puerto Rico had expired, and he appeared to meet the regulatory definition of an attorney, as provided in 8 C.F.R. § 1.1(f). The Immigration Judge recommended that the Board therefore reinstate the respondent, pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 3.107(a).

The respondent moves to be reinstated to practice before the Board, the Immigration Courts, and the Service. The respondent asserts that he has been reinstated to practice in Puerto Rico, where he was first disciplined, and has offered evidence to that effect. The Office of General Counsel for the Executive Office for Immigration Review, who initiated these disciplinary proceedings, does not oppose the motion and notes that the respondent appears to meet the definition of attorney as provided in 8 C.F.R. § 1.1(f). The Service has not responded to the motion.

Given that the respondent has been reinstated to practice law in Puerto Rico, his motion is unopposed, and there appear to be no adverse factors in his case, we find that the respondent should be and hereby is reinstated to practice before the Board, the Immigration Courts, and the Service, as of the date of this order. Because the respondent has been reinstated, public notices regarding the respondent's suspension by the Board should be withdrawn.